

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JEFFERY JACKSON,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	No. 1:25-cv-196
v.	)	
	)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
U.S. GOVERNMENT, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

This matter comes before the court on Plaintiff Jeffery Jackson’s objection. (ECF No. 7). Judge Vermaat issued a report and recommendation. (ECF No. 6). The court will adopt the report and recommendation over Plaintiff’s objection.

**I.**

*Pro se* Plaintiff filed this complaint against the United States Government, the U.S. Department of State, the U.S. Department of Defense, and the Office of Management and Budget. (ECF No. 1). Jackson claims that he is a direct descendant of the Moroccan Empire and complains that Defendants violated his treaty protections and constitutional rights and failed to fulfill federal obligations. (*Id.* at PageID.1). Further, Jackson says that the Office of Management and Budget uses the racial classification “Black” which he alleges “is inherently illogical and depriving nature.” (*Id.*). The report and recommendations details Plaintiff’s history of filing frivolous lawsuits with this court. (ECF No. 6). It also recommends that Plaintiff be prohibited from filing a lawsuit “in this Court without the prepayment of the filing fee, unless Jackson obtains a signature from a licensed attorney admitted to the Western

District of Michigan certifying that Jackson’s complaint is not frivolous, malicious, or brought for an improper purpose.” (*Id.* at PageID.20).

## II.

After being served with a report and recommendation issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam). An “objection does not oblige the district court to ignore the report and recommendation.” *Pharmacy Recs. v. Nassar*, 465 F. App’x 448, 456 (6th Cir. 2012). Our Local Rules require any party objecting to a report and recommendation to “specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.” W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b); *see also Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995) (holding that “objections disput[ing] the correctness of the magistrate’s recommendation but fail[ing] to specify the findings . . . believed [to be] in error” are too general).

## III.

The court has reviewed Plaintiff’s objections to the report and recommendation. Like Plaintiff’s other filings and actions, Plaintiff failed to articulate nonfrivolous arguments and assertions. Plaintiff was repeatedly warned, yet he continues to waste court resources. He will

no longer do so, and this court will summarily reject his objections as frivolous and erroneous. *See Pharmacy Recs.*, 465 F. App'x at 456; *Miller*, 50 F.3d at 380.

**IV.**

The court has reviewed this file. Plaintiff fails to state a claim, and his action will be dismissed. Further, Plaintiff Jeffery Jackson must prepay all future filing fees unless he obtains a signature from a licensed attorney admitted to the Western District of Michigan certifying that Jackson's complaint is not frivolous, malicious, or brought for an improper purpose.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the report and recommendation (ECF No. 6) is **ADOPTED** by the court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's objection to the report and recommendation (ECF No. 7) is **DENIED**.

Judgment to follow.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: March 26, 2025

/s/ Paul L. Maloney  
Paul L. Maloney  
United States District Judge